



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,259	05/09/2001	Elizabeth A. Batson	10007160-1	4065
7590 09/09/2004			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			HU, JINSONG	
Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	
P.O. Box 272400			2154	
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/852,259

Applicant(s)

BATSON ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta (US 6,516,315).

4. As per claims 1 and 7-8, Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a computer-implemented method for managing access to computer-provided services for a plurality of requesters [col. 2, lines 27-60], comprising:

defining combinations of access characteristics and associating each of the combinations with a security level, associating each of the services with one of the security levels [col. 4, lines 45-52; col. 6, line 51 – col. 7, line 44];

processing a login request from a requester, whereby a session is initiated [col. 3, lines 21-28; col. 9, lines 61-67];

determining access characteristics of the session, receiving a request for one of the services from the requester and granting access to the one of the services if the access characteristics of the session are associated with a security level that satisfies the security level associated with the one of the services [col. 3, lines 28-34; col. 10, lines 1-36].

5. As per claim 2, Gupta teaches the step of prompting the requester for authentication data if the access characteristics of the session are associated with a security level that does not satisfy the security level requirement associated with the one of the services [col. 11, lines 5-15].

6. As per claim 4, Gupta teaches the access characteristics include ownership rights of a device with which the session is maintained [col. 7, line 47 – col. 8, line 32].

7. As per claim 5, Gupta teaches the access characteristics include characteristics of a network over which the session is maintained [col. 12, lines 17-21].

8. As per claim 9, Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a plurality of communications devices coupled to one or more computer-provided services via a gateway arrangement [92, Fig. 6], a method for managing access to the services for a plurality of users at the communications devices [col. 2, lines 27-60], comprising:

defining combinations of access characteristics and associating each of the

Art Unit: 2154

combinations with a security level at the gateway arrangement, associating each of the services with one of the security levels at the gateway arrangement [col. 4, lines 45-52; col.6, line 51 – col. 7, line 44];

processing a login request from a user at the gateway arrangement, whereby a session is initiated between a communications device and a service [col. 3, lines 21-28; col. 9, lines 61-67]; and

determining access characteristics of the session at the gateway arrangement, receiving at the gateway arrangement a request for one of the services from the user of the communications device and granting access to the one of the services if the access characteristics of the session are associated with a security level that satisfies the security level associated with the one of the services [col. 3, lines 28-34; col. 10, lines 1-36].

9. As per claims 10, 12-13 and 15-16, since they are method claims of claims 2, 4-5 and 7-8, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 2, 4-5 and 7-8 above.

10. As per claims 17 and 18, since they are apparatus claims of 1 and 9, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1 and 9 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2154

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3, 6, 11, 14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta (US 6,516,315) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-13 and 15-18 above.

13. As per claims 3, 11 and 19, Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Gupta does not specifically teach the access characteristics include a type of device with which the session is maintained. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the information of the type of device to access characteristic in Gupta's system because doing so would improve the quality of the service by quickly realizing the user's device type and providing relevant service to the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Gupta's system with type of device information to improve the functionality of the system.

14. As per claim 6, 14 and 20, Gupta teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Gupta does not specifically teach the step of authenticating the requester with a selected authentication method, wherein the access characteristics include characteristics of the authentication method. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including

authentication method selection in Gupta's system because doing so would improve the dynamic ability of the system by allowing users select a method based on their preference and need. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Gupta's system with authentication method selection to bring convenience of the system.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Kuroda (US 5,935,248) discloses a security level apparatus;

Brown et al. (US 5,941,947) discloses an access control system;

Clark et al. (US 6,058,378) discloses a electronic service system;

Britton et al. (US 6,405,202) discloses a user access control system; and

Mehring et al. (US 6,609,115) discloses an on-line access control system.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5932. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Application/Control Number: 09/852,259
Art Unit: 2154

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

September 2, 2004

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100